1 2 3 4	EDWARD A. RUTTENBERG (State Bar No. 67378) ROBERT S. GUTIERREZ (State Bar No. 143223) LEOPOLD, PETRICH & SMITH, P.C. 2049 Century Park East, Suite 3110 Los Angeles, California 90067-3274 Tel: (310) 277-3333 • Fax: (310) 277-7444 E-Mail: eruttenberg@lpsla.com; rgutierrez@lpsla.com		
5	Attorneys for Defendant BMG MUSIC (erroneously named as "RCA Records")		
6	Bivid wosic (enoneously hamed as RCA Records )		
7	TAUTED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
9	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10	OAKLAND DIVISION		
11			
12	TOMMY DUNBAR and JAMES	CASE NO.: C 07-2758 WDB	
13	GANGWER,	ANSWER TO COMPLAINT BY	
14	Plaintiffs,	DEFENDANT BMG MUSIC (erroneously named as "RCA	
15	V.	Records")	
16	LUCASZ GOTTWALD (aka Dr. Luke), AVRIL LAVIGNE, KASZ MONEY		
17	PUBLISHING, AVRIL LAVIGNE PUBLISHING LLC, ALMO MUSIC		
18	CORP., RCA RECÓRDS, and APPLE, INC.,		
19	Defendants.		
20			
21			
22			
23	For itself alone and for no other defe	ndant, BMG MUSIC (erroneously named	
24	"RCA Records") ("Answering Defendant"), by its undersigned attorneys, admits,		
25	denies and otherwise responds as follows to the Complaint filed against it by plaintiffs		
26	TOMMY DUNBAR and JAMES GANGWER ("Plaintiffs") in the above-entitled		
27	matter:		
28			
LEOPOLD, PETRICH & SMITH A Professional Corporation	7413.doc	1	

1. Answering Defendant admits that Plaintiffs have filed a civil action against it for alleged copyright infringement, in which they demand jury trial to the extent provided in Fed. R. Civ. P. 38(a). Except as expressly admitted, Answering Defendant denies generally and specifically each allegation contained in Paragraph 1 of the Complaint.

## JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 2. Answering Defendant admits that the Court has subject matter jurisdiction over Plaintiffs' Complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1338(a). Except as expressly admitted, Answering Defendant denies generally and specifically each allegation contained in Paragraph 2 of the Complaint to the extent that it applies to it, and denies for lack of sufficient knowledge or information each allegation contained in Paragraph 2 of the Complaint to the extent that it applies to other defendants.
- 3. Answering Defendant denies generally and specifically each allegation contained in Paragraph 3 of the Complaint to the extent that it applies to it, and denies for lack of sufficient knowledge or information each allegation contained in Paragraph 3 to the extent that it applies to other defendants.

## THE PARTIES

- 4. Answering Defendant denies for lack of sufficient knowledge or information each allegation contained in Paragraph 4 of the Complaint.
- 5. Answering Defendant denies for lack of sufficient knowledge or information each allegation contained in Paragraph 5 of the Complaint.

***	6. Answering Defendant denies for lack of sufficient knowledge or	
2	information each allegation contained in Paragraph 6 of the Complaint.	
3		
4	7. Answering Defendant denies for lack of sufficient knowledge or	
5	information each allegation contained in Paragraph 7 of the Complaint.	
6		
7	8. Answering Defendant denies for lack of sufficient knowledge or	
8	information each allegation contained in Paragraph 8 of the Complaint.	
9		
10	9. Answering Defendant denies for lack of sufficient knowledge or	
11	information each allegation contained in Paragraph 9 of the Complaint.	
12		
13	10. Answering Defendant denies for lack of sufficient knowledge or	
14	information each allegation contained in Paragraph 10 of the Complaint.	
15		
16	11. Answering Defendant admits that it does business in California. Except	
17	as expressly admitted, Answering Defendant denies generally and specifically each	
18	allegation contained in Paragraph 11 of the Complaint.	
19		
20	12. Answering Defendant denies for lack of sufficient knowledge or	
21	information each allegation contained in Paragraph 12 of the Complaint.	
22		
23	13. Answering Defendant denies generally and specifically each allegation	
24	contained in Paragraph 13 of the Complaint.	
25		
26		
27		
28		

1 2

## (Against All Defendants)

information each allegation contained in Paragraph 14 of the Complaint.

information each allegation contained in Paragraph 15 of the Complaint.

information each allegation contained in Paragraph 16 of the Complaint.

CLAIM FOR COPYRIGHT INFRINGEMENT

Answering Defendant denies for lack of sufficient knowledge or

Answering Defendant denies for lack of sufficient knowledge or

Answering Defendant denies for lack of sufficient knowledge or

it to exploit protectible expression from the song "I Wanna Be Your Boyfriend," but

Answering Defendant denies generally and specifically that it used all or any portion

of the song "I Wanna Be Your Boyfriend" (protectible or otherwise), and further

denies generally and specifically that anyone holds any rights in any portion of the

song "I Wanna Be Your Boyfriend" other than in its protectible expression. Except as

Answering Defendant admits that Plaintiffs have not expressly authorized

3

4

14.

15.

16.

17.

5

7 8

9

1011

12

13

1415

1617

18

19 20

2122

23

2425

26

27

28

expressly admitted, Answering Defendant denies generally and specifically each other allegation contained in Paragraph 17 of the Complaint.

18. Answering Defendant denies generally and specifically each allegation contained in Paragraph 18 of the Complaint.

19. Answering Defendant denies generally and specifically each allegation contained in Paragraph 19 of the Complaint.

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE 1 (No Claim Stated) 2 3 20. Plaintiffs' Complaint fails to state facts sufficient to constitute a claim for 4 5 relief against Answering Defendant. 6 SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE 7 (17 U.S.C. § 412) 8 9 Plaintiffs' claims for relief are barred and/or limited by the provisions of 10 21. 17 U.S.C. § 412. 11 12 THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE 13 (17 U.S.C. § 411(a)) 14 15 Plaintiffs' action is barred and/or limited by the provisions of 17 U.S.C. 22. 16 § 411(a). 17 18 FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE 19 20 (Unclean Hands) 21 Plaintiffs' action is barred in whole or in part by reason of plaintiffs' 22 23. 23 unclean hands. 24 25 26 27 28

LEOPOLD, PETRICH & SMITH A Professional Corporatio

FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE 1 2 (Lack of Standing) 3 4 24. Plaintiffs' action is barred in whole or in part because one or both 5 plaintiffs lack standing to prosecute such action. 6 7 SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE (Fair Use) 8 9 Plaintiffs' action is barred in whole or in part by the doctrine of fair use, 10 25. 11 to the extent any such use occurred, which use Answering Defendant denies but here 12 assumes merely for the sake of argument. 13 14 SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE (First Amendment) 15 16 17 26. Plaintiffs' action is barred in whole or in part because, to the extent any such use occurred, which use Answering Defendant denies but here assumes merely 18 19 for the sake of argument, the purported use of plaintiffs' purportedly copyrightable 20 materials on which their claims rest constituted a use protected by the First Amendment to the United States Constitution, 21 22 23 EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE 24 (De Minimis Use) 25 Plaintiffs' action is barred by the doctrine of de minimis use to the extent 26 27. any such use occurred, which use Answering Defendant denies but here assumes 27

LEOPOLD, PETRICH & SMITH A Professional Corporation

28

merely for the sake of argument.

## 1 NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE 2 (No Willful Infringement) 3 28. Plaintiffs' claims for relief are barred in whole or in part because any use 4 5 by Answering Defendant, which use Answering Defendant denies but here assumes merely for the sake of argument, was not willful. 6 7 8 TENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE 9 (Estoppel) 10 Plaintiffs' action is barred by Plaintiffs' own conduct and actions, which 11 29. 12 amount to and constitute an estoppel of the claims made by them in their Complaint. 13 14 ELEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE (Waiver) 15 16 17 30. Plaintiffs' action is barred by Plaintiffs' own conduct and actions, which 18 amount to and constitute a waiver of any right or rights Plaintiffs might have had in 19 relation to the matters alleged in the Complaint. 20 WHEREFORE, Answering Defendant BMG MUSIC prays as follows: 21 22 That the Complaint be dismissed with prejudice and that Plaintiffs 23 1. take nothing herein; 24 25 26 2. That Answering Defendant be awarded its costs of suit, including its reasonable attorneys' fees, incurred in defense of this action; and 27 28

1	3. That Answering Defendant be awarded such other and further		
2	relief as the Court may deem just and proper.		
3			
4	C.N.D.++ o		
5	DATED: August 15, 2007  EDWARD A. RUTTENBERG		
6	ROBERT S. GUTIERREZ LEOPOLD, PETRICH & SMITH, P.C.		
7	LEOPOLD, PETRICH & SMITH, P.C. Attorneys for Defendant BMG MUSIC (erroneously named as "RCA Records")		
8	Records")		
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24	·		
25			
26   27			
28			
~ U			

LEOPOLD, PETRICH & SMITH A Professional Corporation

1		PROOF OF SERVICE	
2	STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES		
3 4	I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18 years and not a party to the within action. My business address is 2049 Century Park East, Suite 3110, Los Angeles, California 90067-3274.		
5 6	On August 15, 2007, I served the foregoing document described as ANSWER TO COMPLAINT BY DEFENDANT BMG MUSIC (erroneously named as "RCA Records") on the interested parties in this action.		
7	×	by placing the original thereof enclosed in (a) sealed envelope(s), addressed as follows:	
8	_	SEE ATTACHED SERVICE LIST	
9	×	BY REGULAR MAIL: I deposited such envelope in the mail at 2049 Century Park East,	
10		Suite 3110, Los Angeles, California 90067-3274. The envelope was mailed with postage thereon fully prepaid.	
11		I am "readily familiar" with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence	
12 13	if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one (1) day after date of d		
14	BY FACSIMILE MACHINE: I transmitted a true copy of said document(s) by facsimil machine, and no error was reported. Said fax transmission(s) were directed as indicated or		
15			
16 17	BY OVERNIGHT MAIL: I deposited such documents at the Federal Express Drop Box located at 2049 Century Park East, Suite 3110, Los Angeles, California 90067-3274. The envelope was deposited with delivery fees thereon fully prepaid.		
18 19	BY PERSONAL SERVICE: I caused such envelope(s) to be delivered by hand to the above addressee(s).		
20		(State) I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.	
21	×	(Federal) I declare that I am employed in the office of a member of the Bar of this Court, at	
22		whose direction the service was made. I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.	
23		Executed on August 15, 2007, at Los Angeles, California.	
24			
25		/s/ Kathryn Toyama	
26		757 Ixatiiyii 10yanta	
27			
28			
RICH			

LEOPOLD, PETRICH & SMITH
A Professional Corporation 7413.doc

1	SERVICE LIST		
2			
3 4	David M. Given, Esq. Nicholas A. Carlin, Esq.	Michael A. Guido, Esq. Carroll, Guido & Groffman 1790 Broadway, 20th Floor	
5	Phillips, Erlewine & Given LLP One Embarcadero Suite 2350 San Francisco, California 94111	New York, NY 10019 Tel: (212) 759-2300	
6	Tel: (415) 398-0900 Fax: (415) 398-0911	Fax: (212) 759-9556	
7	Donald M. Carley, Esq.	Christine Lepera, Esq.	
8 9	Sonnenschein Nath & Rosenthal LLP 525 Market Street, 26th Floor	Sonnenschein Nath & Rosenthal LLP 1221 Avenue of the Americas New York, NY 10020-1089	
0	San Francisco, CA 94105-2708 Tel: (415) 882-5000	Tel: (212) 768-6700 Fax: (212) 768-6800	
1	Fax: (415) 882-0300		
12	Daniel S. Schecter, Esq. Colin B. Vandell, Esq. Latham & Watkins, LLP		
13 14	633 West Fifth Street, Suite 4000 Los Angeles, CA 90071-2007		
5	Tel: (213) 891-7371 Fax: (213) 891-8763		
6			
7			
8			
9			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26   27			
28			

LEOPOLD, PETRICH & SMITH A Professional Corporation